o may d filed tion so s from desires nay do of the

llee.

e, eral.

october c., apcust 4,

es wine

Duncase Court of the Chiles Acres

7. (SE

CHARLES F. HENY, RESTOROS OF THE BUTCH OF WILLIAM WESTELL, DECEMBER, Appellost,

The Univer Status, Appelled

APPEAL PROOF THE COURT OF CLASS.

DRIEF FOR APPEALANT.

A. R. Suvers Bree E. Bancow, A.-S. Taavni Attorneys for Appellant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	LAUE
Statement of Facts	1-5
Assignment of Errors	5
Argument	5 - 29
I. Right of action vested in Weighel	5-10
Service sued for requested of Weighel	
and performed by him	5, 6
Service sued for not covered by contract	6
Service sued for of different character	
than that covered by contract	6, 7
Service performed under protest	6
Performance by subcontractor is per-	
formance by contractor	7,8
Construction placed upon performance	
by parties	8
Subcontract never filed and subcontrac-	
tor acquired no rights	8,9
The right of action vested in Weighel.	9
II. Service sued for not covered by contract	10 - 17
(a) Service sued for expressly excluded	
from contract	10 - 13
Contract made advertisement part	
thereof	10, 11
Advertisement directed bidders in-	
quire Postmaster	11
Postmaster represented service	
later required not covered by contract	11, 12
Discussion Hollerbach vs. U. S. and	
Christie vs. U. S	12, 13
Discussion Utah, Nevada & Califor-	
nia Stage Co. vs. U. S	13
Simpson vs. U. S. distinguished	
from above cases	14
(b) Great increase in service not con-	
templated by defendants or contractor	
and not covered by contract	14, 15

	PAGE
Application of Utah, Nevada & Cali-	
fornia State Co. case	15, 16
(c) Slavens and Proffit cases discussed	
and distinguished from present case.	16, 17
III. Travis had no right of action against de-	
fendants	18-25
He acquired no rights:	
(1) By express contract	18
(2) By implied contract	18-20
(3) By novation	20, 21
(4) By assignment	21, 22
(5) Under 22 Stat. L. 53	22
(6) Under 20 Stat. L. 62	22
Statute prescribes manner of rec-	
ognition of subcontractor	22, 23
Statutory method must must be	
followed	23
Government officials cannot con-	
fer right of suit except in ac-	
cordance with statutory method	23, 24
1V. Petition by subcontractor has no bearing	
on this case	25
V. Claimant and his decedent have continu-	
ously asserted their rights	25, 26
VI. Discussion of the opinion of the lower court	26, 27
(1) Departmental recognition does not	
take the place of statutory require-	
ments	26
(2) Performance by subcontractor is	
performance by contractor	26, 27
(3) The fact that Weighel had not paid	
Travis does not affect Weighel's	
right to sue defendants	27
Conclusion:	
Right of action vested in Weighel	27, 28
Travis was neither a necessary or admissi-	
ble party	28
Discussion Cole vs. Ralph	28, 29

LIST OF CITATIONS

Arkansas Smelting Co. vs. Belden Mining Co., 127 U. S., 379		PAGE
127 U. S., 379	Arkansas Smelting Co. vs. Belden Mining Co.,	
Carr vs. United States, 98 U. S., 433	127 U. S., 379	18
Case vs. Terrell, 78 U. S., 199	Carr vs. United States, 98 U. S., 433	24
Christie vs. United States, 237 U. S., 234	Case vs. Terrell, 78 U. S., 199	24
Cole vs. Ralph, 252 U. S., 286	Christie vs. United States, 237 U. S., 234	6, 13
Coleman vs. United States, 152 U. S., 96	Cole vs. Ralph, 252 U. S., 286	28
Conti vs. Johnson et al., 91 Vt., 467	Coleman vs. United States, 152 U. S., 96	19
Elliott on Contracts, Vol. 2, 609, Sec. 1365	Conti vs. Johnson et al., 91 Vt., 467	8
Harley vs. United States 198 U. S., 229	Cyc., 30, 77	28
Harley vs. United States 198 U. S., 229	Elliott on Contracts, Vol. 2, 609, Sec. 1365	
Kellogg vs. United States, 7 Wall., 361	Harley vs. United States 198 U. S., 229	
Proffit, Samuel G. vs. United States, 42 Ct. Cl., 248		
248		8
Rock Island, Arkansas & Louisiana R. R. Co. vs. United States, Adv. Ops. Oct. Term, 1920, 66 23 Slavens, Luther Clay vs. United States, 38 Ct. Cl. 576, 196 U. S., 229 16, 17 Simpson vs. United States, 172 U. S., 372 14 Stanley vs. Schwalby, 162 U. S., 255 23, 24 United States vs. Atlantic Dredging Co., 253 U. S., 11 6, 13 United States vs. Driscoll, 96 U. S., 421 8 United States vs. Lee, 106 U. S., 196 24 United States vs. Spearin, 248 U. S., 132 6, 13 United States vs. Utah, Nevada & California Stage Co., 199 U. S., 414 6, 7, 13, 15 APPENDIX Chap. 116, 22 Stat. L. 53 20, 22 Sec. 2, 20 Stat. L. 62 30 Sec. 3, 20 Stat. L. 62 22, 27 Sec. 3477, U. S. R. S. 22		
United States, Adv. Ops. Oct. Term, 1920, 66 Slavens, Luther Clay vs. United States, 38 Ct. Cl. 576, 196 U. S., 229	248	16, 17
Slavens, Luther Clay vs. United States, 38 Ct. Cl. 576, 196 U. S., 229		
Cl. 576, 196 U. S., 229	United States, Adv. Ops. Oct. Term, 1920, 66	23
Simpson vs. United States, 172 U. S., 372	Slavens, Luther Clay vs. United States, 38 Ct.	
Stanley vs. Schwalby, 162 U. S., 255	Cl. 576, 196 U. S., 229	
United States vs. Atlantic Dredging Co., 253 U. S., 11	Simpson vs. United States, 172 U. S., 372	
U. S., 11	Stanley vs. Schwalby, 162 U. S., 255	23, 24
United States vs. Driscoll, 96 U. S., 421		
United States vs. Lee, 106 U. S., 196	U. S., 11	
United States vs. Spearin, 248 U. S., 132 6, 13 United States vs. Utah, Nevada & California Stage Co., 199 U. S., 414	United States vs. Driscoil, 96 U. S., 421	700
United States vs. Utah, Nevada & California Stage Co., 199 U. S., 414	United States Vs. Lee, 106 U. S., 196	
Stage Co., 199 U. S., 414	United States vs. Spearin, 248 U. S., 132	6, 13
APPENDIX Chap. 116, 22 Stat. L. 53		10 15
Chap. 116, 22 Stat. L. 53. 20, 22 Sec. 2, 20 Stat. L. 62. 30 Sec. 3, 20 Stat. L. 62. 22, 27 Sec. 3477, U. S. R. S. 22	Stage Co., 199 U. S., 414	13, 15
Sec. 2, 20 Stat. L. 62. 30 Sec. 3, 20 Stat. L. 62. 22, 27 Sec. 3477, U. S. R. S. 22	APPENDIX	
Sec. 2, 20 Stat. L. 62. 30 Sec. 3, 20 Stat. L. 62. 22, 27 Sec. 3477, U. S. R. S. 22	Chap. 116, 22 Stat. L. 53	20. 22
Sec. 3, 20 Stat. L. 62	Sec. 2, 20 Stat. L. 62	
Sec. 3477, U. S. R. S	Sec. 3, 20 Stat. L. 62	
Sec. 3963, U. S. R. S	Sec. 3477, U. S. R. S.	22
	Sec. 3963, U. S. R. S	21